

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 10-15, 18 and 19 have been amended. New claim 20 has been added depending from claim 1. Claims 1-15, 18 and 19-20 are pending and under consideration. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1 and 18 can be found at FIG. 3 and pages 6-8 of the Specification.

### **I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 18 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 18 and 19 have been amended to recite "an electronic device". Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

### **II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-15 AND 18-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SREY ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 6,141,436; HEREINAFTER "SREY") IN VIEW OF BONGIORNO ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 6,292,045; HEREINAFTER "BONGIORNO"):**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a data converter connectable to and disconnectable from an external device so as to allow data exchange between the data converter and the external device, the data converter comprising a data conversion unit configured to encrypt data generated in the external device and return the encrypted data thereto when receiving the generated data transmitted from the external device, and to decrypt the encrypted data and return the decrypted data to the external device when receiving the encrypted data from the external device".

Further, amended claim 1 recites "a lock system configured to lock a data conversion function of said data conversion unit in a disabled state after a passage of a predetermined period of time so as to prevent said data conversion unit from encrypting and decrypting the data".

In FIG. 5, Srey discloses a cellular phone having a scanner for scanning a fingerprint and to generate an image of the fingerprint to determine whether the fingerprint matches a fingerprint stored in memory (see column 8, lines 50-60).

Srey fails to disclose or suggest that the cellular phone 300 of FIG. 3, having a transmitting functioning as encryption and decryption of the data comparable to the Applicants' "data conversion unit".

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Srey fails to disclose a timer unit

for counting the time for disabling a locking system. However, the Examiner asserts that Bongiorno discloses this feature.

Bongiorno discloses a circuit and method for detecting and selecting clock sources. Specifically, Bongiorno mentions a cellular phone which contains at least one microprocessor or microprocessor-based chip that essentially acts as the brain to perform arithmetic and logic and to control operations (see column 1, lines 10-15). Further, Bongiorno discloses a timer to protect the microprocessor-based system from a control failure, a system lockup, equipment faults or other malfunctions (see column 2, lines 35-39).

Neither Srey nor Bongiorno, individually or combined, disclose all of the features recited in amended claim 1 mentioned above. That is, the cellular phone of Srey fails to disclose a data conversion unit connectable to and disconnectable from an external device for encrypting and decrypting purposes. Further, Srey fails to disclose "a lock system configured to lock a data conversion function of said data conversion unit in a disabled state after a passage of a predetermined period of time so as to prevent said data conversion unit from encrypting and decrypting the data". In addition, Bongiorno fails to make up for the deficiencies of Srey.

Therefore, the combination of Srey and Bongiorno teaches away from the present invention, and therefore fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

### III. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 19, 2008

By: Deidre M. Davis  
Deidre M. Davis  
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501